



Official Minutes of the  
City of Cottonwood Development Review Board Meeting  
Held June 26, 2008 at 2:00 PM at the  
Community Development Conference Room  
821 N. Main Street Cottonwood, Arizona

---

## Call to Order

Chairperson Backus called the meeting to order at 2:15 PM.

## Roll Call

Chairperson Backus	Present	Member Knowles	Absent
Vice Chairperson Anderson	Absent	Member Wasden	Absent
Member Bartmus	Present	Member Lovett*	Present
Member Cox	Present	*(P&Z Commiss. Rep)	

## Staff Present:

George Gehlert, Community Development Director	Wes Ballew, Staff Planner
Casey Rooney, Economic Development Director	Jackie Foxton, Administrative Coordinator
Morgan Scott, City Engineer	

## Public Present:

Craig Backus	Greg Hitchens	Doug Huberman
Grace Lahr	Pete Schultz	Phil Terbell

## Consideration of minutes – May 22, 2008

*Member Lovett moved to approve the May 22, 2008 minutes as written. Member Cox seconded and the motion carried unanimously.*

## DRB 08-018 - Taco Bell Remodel - APN: 406-55-062D

Review plans to renovate the existing Taco Bell restaurant located on .69 acres in a C-2 (Heavy Commercial) zone at 2140 E. SR89A. Owner: Eardley Investments, Inc. dba Taco Bell. Agent: Greg Hitchens.

Planner Ballew presented the staff memo. He said the proposed project is primarily a façade renovation, but also includes new lighting and signage. No additional space would be added to the store and only minimal site improvements. The existing landscaping appears to be appropriate.

Mr. Ballew highlighted a potential issue of traffic stacking at the exit onto Cove Parkway, particularly on busy weekend days.

He projected current site photos and elevations and explained the following issues, which staff felt the Board might want to consider.

- Banding – The proposed banding is very colorful and does not fit with nearby structures. The board may want to determine whether this is a good fit for the area

- Is the arch detailing above the roofline appropriate?
- The window lights shown on the elevations do not conform to the Cottonwood Zoning Ordinance requirements. All lights must be fully shielded.
- There is no detail on dumpster location
- There is no detail on location and screening of mechanical units.
- Is there a backflow device proposed?

Member Bartmus asked if the arches were part of the identification and if they would be considered signage. Mr. Ballew said staff discussed that but did not reach a determination.

Chairperson Backus invited the applicant to speak.

Greg Hitchens, applicant and architect for the project, introduced Grace Lahr, one of the owners. Mr. Hitchens said they are in agreement with the points raised in the staff memo. Addressing some of those points, he explained the following.

- Taco Bell Corporate requires a franchisee to change certain elements of the building when the store has its 20-year anniversary as a condition of renewing the franchise.
- Corporate is willing to compromise on some elements of the design.
- The arch is metal, simulates the bell, and the façade is the modern look they are seeking.
- In some instances, they illuminate the arches but they would not do that here because it would violate the Dark Sky ordinance.
- The light fixtures may not be depicted accurately but all light fixtures would be shielded and meet the Dark Sky ordinance.
- The dumpster is existing.
- They want to move the driveway but it is a shared driveway with the two businesses to the north. Wendy's is in agreement with moving the driveway to the back of the property but the property next to them is not. They will pursue the move but they cannot do it until all three parties agree.

Board members and applicants discussed the following

- Driveway - the third party's concern is he would lose parking with that proposal.
- Colors – color samples are more subtle than the rendering – especially the orange. Some members wanted the colors more subdued.
- Arches – are inappropriate for the area.
  1. Could be considered signage because they would be removed from the building if the business left.
  2. Could be lowered to below the roofline and incorporated as architectural detail.

Chairperson Backus talked about a Taco Bell store in the Phoenix area with the modern scheme and the arches are not particularly noticeable. However, he felt the building was “wild looking” and “unattractive.” Board members asked to see the photos and the applicants had them delivered during the meeting. The Board discussed the colors and the arches.

- Outdoor dining area renovation would include:
  1. Remove the existing flooring (a slippery surface) and leave it as stained concrete
  2. New seating

3. New color scheme
  4. Replace elements of the structure as needed
  5. Repaint.
- Fire Sprinkler – building is not currently sprinkled. This renovation would not trigger the requirement to sprinkle per Director Gehlert.
  - Mechanical units would be roof mounted and screened by a parapet (not visible from the ground).
  - Change in freestanding sign – colors would change. Will be detailed in sign package.
  - Signs would be below the plate line but are in excess of 15 feet high (about 17 feet).
  - The Board approved the proposed banding based on the colors depicted in the photos.

**Member Lovett motioned to approve DRB 08-018 with five stipulations, as follows:**

1. **Development in conformance with site/landscape plan, elevations, colors, and materials dated 6-12-08.**
2. **That the development conform to the Code Review comments of 5-6-08.**
3. **All exterior lighting conform to Section 408 of the Zoning Ordinance with regard to shielding, lumen count, and fixture type. Mercury vapor fixtures are not permitted.**
4. **Lower the flying arches below the roofline to incorporate them as a part of the architecture.**
5. **The tile in the outdoor patio be changed to something that is not as slippery.**

**Members Cox and Bartmus seconded (simultaneously) and the Board voted unanimously for approval.**

**DRB 08-021 - High Five Hangar Association - APN: 406-08-068**

**Review plans for construction of five airplane hangars on 1.02 acres zoned I-2 (Heavy Industrial) located in Cottonwood Airpark Tract 1 at 668 Airpark Road. Owner: City of Cottonwood. Applicant/Agent: Bob or Craig Backus.**

Chairperson Backus recused himself due to a conflict of interest because of his part ownership of the project. Member Cox served as acting chairperson and introduced the item.

Director Gehlert announced a lack of a quorum and said the Board could not take formal action. He explained that the item was on the agenda at his request and noted the Board previously approved the series of hangars with similar design. The reason he put these hangars on the agenda was that they are in close proximity to a residential area and he contemplates the continuation of the taxiway. There are five hangars on one parcel, which created some code issues. Mr. Gehlert said he was comfortable with acting administratively on this issue but requested input from the Board.

Planner Ballew presented the staff memo as follows.

The project is located at the end of Airpark Road. This project is part of the Cottonwood Airpark Phase II project, approved for 13-lot development with one hangar on each lot. The proposed project is a five unit “hangar condominium” on one lot. The hangars back up to the taxiway for the airport. The taxiway will be extended around the corner in order to accommodate two of the hangars in this development. Most of the parking will take place in the hangars, with 13 parking

spaces on the outside of the hangars. The proposed buildings are steel hangars with a stucco wainscoting on the lower portion of the building, and blue trim. There is a residential neighborhood within sight of the proposed hangars. It is important to address the visual impacts these hangars will have on the neighborhood.

There are several issues that the board may wish to consider:

- Parking layout – the proposed parking backs out over a sidewalk and onto Airpark Drive, a public street. Doing so is prohibited by the Cottonwood Zoning Ordinance. A variance may be required for this situation. Any input from the board on potential parking layouts would be appreciated
- Have Public Works comments from the recent Code Review meeting been addressed? This includes issues with grading, drainage and retention, and shifting the building footprint to allow access to hangar three from the front to keep cars off the taxiway.
- The stucco wainscoting should be continued along the entire front portion of the building.
- No details were provided on the fencing surrounding the property. A fence with some screening qualities is preferred.

Mr. Ballew projected photos of the site. He and Director Gehlert explained the location of the proposal, its relationship to the residential neighborhood, and the zoning.

Planner Ballew said staff recommended approval of the project with the following stipulations:

1. That a Variance for the parking be approved by the Board of Adjustment.
2. That an amendment to the subdivision plat be obtained to allow the condominiums on a previously platted subdivision.
3. All exterior lighting to conform to Section 408 of the Zoning Ordinance with regard to shielding, lumen count, and fixture type. Mercury vapor fixtures are not permitted.
4. That visual impacts to the residential area nearby be mitigated.

Member Lovett asked about mitigating the impact on houses. Director Gehlert led a discussion about mitigation. He said there is a wash that provides some separation between the hangars and the residential. There are currently two houses in the residential area (Tierra Verde II) and the remainder is empty lots. There was a disclosure about the proximity to the airport as part of the platting. Highlights of the lengthy discussion were as follows.

- There would be a six-foot high chain link fence to maintain airport security.
- Slats in chain link fencing cause issues with wind and drainage. With the bushes and trees as tall as they are around that area, nothing would be gained by installing slats.
- The Airport Commission will be happy with the most hangars we can put on the airport.

Speaking as the applicant, Bob Backus reported that Tim Costello (city engineer) had no problem with vehicles backing into the cul-de-sac because it is at the end of Airpark Road and not an area with traffic moving through. Mr. Backus also talked about stopping the sidewalk at the start of the cul-de-sac, which was what the city wanted. He explained that the buildings have to match the taxiway height and that means they are three feet above the street. Flat areas required by running sidewalks all the way around would make the driveways steep.

Answering Member Bartmus' question, Director Gehlert said there are a couple of variance issues resulting from the site design. One is backing into the street. Although staff has no "heartburn" about backing into the street in this situation, staff cannot approve a variance. The other issue is the sidewalk. Both are issues requiring Board of Adjustment response. With those exceptions, this plan "conforms to what is going on further down the way." The exception is that they have five hangars on one large lot but it is still a tight squeeze.

Mr. Backus offered the following information in answer to questions.

- Minimum driveway length is twenty feet.
- Turn-a-round meets fire department standards.
- Street would be signed for no parking on the street. It is not a business so the only need for parking is the pilots coming and going.
- The airport layout plan submitted to the FAA specifically states that these lots are for aviation use.

Director Gehlert invited board member comments to pass on to the Board of Adjustment. He said the applicant must demonstrate a hardship to the Board of Adjustment.

Member Cox asked if the stucco could be expanded to break up the flatness of the wall. Craig and Bob Backus said it is better to keep the stucco low on the building. Craig Backus said he left some windows out of the drawing but they would break up the wall. Bob Backus said there are windows in every unit. Craig Backus said the better option is to take the windows up higher to break up the mass. That would put natural light into the hangar without skylights. Member Cox suggested putting a canopy over the windows and doors. Using a laser pointer on projected elevations, Bob Backus showed where the windows were planned. No one objected to using the windows to break up the mass.

**Plans were reviewed and discussed but no action was taken because there was not a quorum present.**

**DRB 08-006 Verde Valley Shopping Plaza Renovation APN: 406-06-028E & 406-02-020 Review plans for the renovation of an existing shopping center on approximately 9 acres zoned C-1 (Light Commercial) located at 1419 E. SR89A. Owner: Verde Valley Plaza, LLC. Applicant: American General Design. Agent: Vigen Pezeshkian.**

Planner Ballew introduced the hearing item saying that it is a façade renovation of the existing Food City shopping center. He projected graphics depicting the existing shopping center, the proposed renovations, and the surrounding area. Points of his presentation were as follows.

The current anchor tenant of the shopping center is Food City. The only new spaces proposed for the center is a snack bar on the west side of the property and two small additions to the rear of the property. The snack bar is proposed for the drive aisle that currently cuts between the existing movie theater and the main shopping center building.

Mr. Ballew highlighted the following.

- Tower Height- Because the center is set back from the street the applicant wishes to build three sign towers that will be nearly 50 feet tall. Two of the towers are detached from the building and in the parking lot. The third is located on the actual retail plaza in the corner where Sears is currently located. Current code only allows building heights of 35 feet. The towers will require a hearing in front of the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Conditional Use Permit to grant permission for the added height. A variance would be required from Board of Adjustment for relief from the sign code to allow a sign that is higher than 15 feet.
- LED sign – The applicant proposed three LED animated signs for the shopping center. Each would be located on the proposed towers. A Conditional Use Permit would be required for each. The code does not speak to LED signs in particular, but animated signs are prohibited. Staff may determine that a variance is required.
- Currently, the parking lot is lighted with mercury vapor lighting, which is against City and State Code. The applicant is proposing to change to high-pressure sodium.
- There are no details of where the trash receptacles would be placed.
- Does the board prefer river rock to the proposed split face rock on the façade?
- Does the site sufficiently address bicycle and pedestrian access needs?
- There are no details of locations and screening of mechanical units.
- Is the landscaping proposed for the parking lot sufficient?
- The board may wish to have the applicant discuss opportunities to improve access points.

Mr. Ballew read the following staff recommended stipulations.

1. Development in conformance with the site/landscape plan, elevations, colors, and materials dated 06-09-08; as may be further modified by the Design Review Board.
2. That the development conforms to the Code Review comments from 3-11-08.
3. That Conditional Use Permits be obtained for the tower height.
4. That variances for the signs that are higher than 15 feet and for the LED signs be approved by the Board of Adjustment.
5. That the applicant reduces the number of LED signs to one if they are approved by the Board of Adjustment.
6. That all exterior lighting conforms to Section 408 of the Zoning Ordinance with regard to shielding, lumen count, and fixture type. Mercury vapor fixtures are not permitted.
7. Submittal of a comprehensive sign plan.
8. Any other stipulations the Board deems necessary.

The Board discussed the sign towers and LED signs. Member Lovett felt the signs at the intersection should not be animated. She also questioned the height. Mr. Ballew said the peak of the shopping center is 35 feet. A 50-foot sign would be 15 feet higher than the peak. Chairperson Backus commented that it is difficult to see tall signs near the road from inside a moving vehicle. However, the shopping center sits low and back from the road. He suggested that the two signs by the street be lower and the one back in the corner could be taller.

*(Transcriber's note: speakers representing the applicant were not identified on the recording or in the notes. Therefore, they will be identified as "applicant" in the minutes. In this context, "applicant" could refer to different people.)*

Responding to board member questions, the applicants offered the following information.

#### CONSTRUCTION

- Renovation would be done section by section to minimize disruption
- Some tenants would be relocated during construction
- Applicant hopes to retain their long-time tenants
- Typically, tenants do not commit until they see the finished project.

#### SIGNS

- Proposed signs are LED
- Signs would not be animated and the glass has a matte finish (applicant said this type of signage is on I-17 at Pinnacle Peak, Camelback, and Peoria and you have to stare at it to tell it is digital).
- Do not plan to show a movie on it - no moving video that would be distracting to drivers.
- Wants something that would change every ten or fifteen seconds.
- Tenants, goods and services of tenants, and public service messages would be displayed (applicant gave examples of public service messages such as license plate and vehicle description in a kidnapping case, a major public hearing, or a festival or other community event).
- Applicant would upgrade interior signage to single-letter channel-lock - same standard they used in Sedona.
- Interior signage would be located above the arches.

#### PARKING

- So far, there is no use change so there would be no change in requirements.
- There would be employee parking in the rear.
- Possible elimination of a driveway could provide additional parking.

PARKING LOT SURFACING - will upgrade.

#### INGRESS/EGRESS

Applicant said they would work with the bank on the entrance issue but they cannot force the bank to do anything. He said they met with city engineering and have a plan that is acceptable to the city. The next step is to meet with the bank.

Applicant is working with the city and the bank and proposes the following.

- Eliminate driveway closest to the bank (if the bank agrees).
- Designate the two entrances closest to the bend in 89A as right-left-in and right-out-only.
- Left outs would be allowed only at the driveways at the extreme distances from the intersection.
- Based on details provided by city staff, this proposal would have eliminated forty-nine of the fifty accidents that occurred in the last five years.
- Applicant would work on Chairperson Backus' suggestion to widen the driveway closest to the theater.

Other items discussed were as follows.

## PEDESTRIAN ORIENTED SPACE

Member Cox commented that he liked the open dining area by the Mexican food restaurant in the corner and the food court. He felt it was a pedestrian friendly atmosphere. However, he felt there should be something similar at the other end of the shopping center. The applicant said there is an opportunity for an outdoor patio adjacent to the old Pizza Hut building, depending on the tenant(s) that come to them.

The applicant cited the following as other pedestrian oriented properties operated by the applicant(s) and described a vision of this shopping center as a “town center” where people would congregate, sip coffee, chat, and conduct business.

## LANDSCAPING

- Chairperson Backus commented about the Mexican Palm shown in the landscape plan and its chance for survival in Cottonwood’s cold temperatures.
- Chairperson Backus requested landscaping in the parking lot to break up and soften the lot if there are enough parking places left.

Director Gehlert commented as follows.

- Referencing staff memo stipulations 3 and 4 regarding sign height, the sign structures are only 35-feet high. Only the towers are higher. A Conditional Use Permit is not needed.
- There could be two variances required for the sign height and for animation or intermittent illumination. If they reduce the signs to 15 feet and eliminate the animation, they would not need those variances.
- The entire sign structure in the corner could be considered a sign.

Discussion ensued regarding Mr. Gehlert’s last comment.

Chairperson Backus asked if the pending sign ordinance related to sign structure and sign height. Director Gehlert said he would look at that and if the proposal conforms to the code amendment, he felt they could work with it. Otherwise, it would be a variance issue.

Member Cox commented that the LED signage should be limited to one side only of the sign face.

Director Gehlert said that the signs on the street could be no higher than fifteen feet and no more than forty square feet without a variance. The applicant said they would look at it – they could definitely lower the height from the proposal but he was not sure fifteen feet would be enough.

Director Gehlert, Director Rooney, and board members praised the project. Mr. Gehlert displayed building materials samples.

Director Gehlert asked questions about the following items and the applicant responded as noted.

- PARKING LOT LIGHTING – the applicant is not sure if they will just replace the mercury vapor lamps or if they will replace some or all of the fixtures.
- MECHANICAL UNITS – will not change. They will be behind parapets and not visible.
- DUMPSTERS – in back parking lot and not enclosed.



- FIRE SPRINKLERS – units that have them will keep them; units that do not have them will not have them because there are no changes beyond the fascia. New construction in the back would be sprinklered.
- BACKFLOW DEVICE – applicant said they have not seen one.

The applicant explained that they want the structure in the corner to be the focal point (rather than the anchor tenant) to draw attention to the fact that it is an overall center.

Director Gehlert explained which subdivisions surround the shopping center and the Board considered how the towers and signs might affect them. The applicant said the LED screens would face away from the residential areas and they are not that bright.

**Member Cox motioned to approve DRB 08-006 with nine stipulations, as follows:**

1. **Development in conformance with the site/landscape plan, elevations colors, and materials dated 6-9-08.**
2. **That the development conform to the Code Review comments from 3-11-08.**
3. **That a Variance for any sign that is higher than 15 feet be approved by the Board of Adjustment.** (Director Gehlert qualified this stipulation referencing the pending sign code amendment that, if passed, would allow placement of signs compatible with the roofline.)
4. **Three non-animated LED signs are allowed with a restriction of a 15 second minimum interval between message changes on the two signs by the street.**
5. **All exterior lighting to conform to Section 408 of the Zoning Ordinance with regard to shielding, lumen count, and fixture type.**
6. **Submittal of a comprehensive sign plan.**
7. **Lower the two sign towers at the street.**
8. **Break up the parking lot with additional landscaping if it can be accomplished and meet parking requirements.**
9. **Widen the western entrance from 89A with a divider between ingress and egress traffic if possible.**

**Member Bartmus seconded and the Board voted unanimously for approval.**

**DRB 08-017 – Cottonwood Commerce Center – APN: 406-04-045W/149H/056D**

**Review plans for construction of a 7,715 sq.ft. multi-tenant retail/office complex to house the Cottonwood Chamber of Commerce, an unnamed drive-through restaurant, and other tenants. The project is located on 1.64 acres (with existing structures) in a C-2 (Heavy Commercial) zone at the intersection of SR 260 and SR 89A (1010 S. Main Street). Owner: North Country Properties and Cottonwood/Verde Valley Chamber of Commerce. Agent: Pete Schultz/Advantia Properties.**

Planner Ballew introduced the Cottonwood Commerce Center proposal and presented the staff memo as follows. Along with the presentation, he projected and explained graphics showing the site, surrounding area and uses, and proposed elevations.

The proposal includes two new single story buildings. The building to the southeast is a drive-through for a proposed Starbucks. The building to the northeast is proposed to have a mix of office and retail tenants. The only confirmed tenants at this time are Starbucks and the Chamber of Commerce. The site was originally a section of land in between a highway turn lane.

Therefore, several utilities cross the parcel and the lot is irregular. It was difficult to coordinate access and other site development.

This project is located on one of the most prominent and heavily trafficked corners in the City of Cottonwood.

There is a fair amount of issues associated with the project.

Issues outlined in the staff memo were as follows. Discussion and additional information provided by Mr. Schultz follows the issues list.

- The applicant has expressed a desire to eventually split the property into four parcels. One for Starbucks and its adjacent parking, one for the Chamber of Commerce, one for the adjacent restaurant space, and one for the parking area on the west side of the property.
- All of the areas would have a cross parking agreement, but the Chamber of Commerce, in particular, is going to need to park some of their visitors in the Home Depot parking lot. They are working with both the City and Home Depot to obtain another cross parking agreement, but it is also important to develop a pedestrian walkway across the private driveway that leads to Home Depot.
- There has been some discussion by the applicants of installing an LED sign for the Chamber of Commerce at the site. The Chamber could use the LED sign to advertise their events and other events happening in the City. This would be an alternative to the banners that the Chamber is currently using at the site. Input from the Board on this issue would be appreciated.
- There is a headlight wall that surrounds the northeast corner of the Starbucks portion of the property. Without proper detailing, the wall could present a blank face to this very important corner. A detailed elevation should be presented to the board before final approval of the project. There is also a need for an additional headlight wall to block headlight glare from the parking area on the western side of the site. This wall should match the other wall along the Starbucks portion of the property.
- The top of the building should have some added detail. A pop out, cornice, or other type of treatment is preferred.
- The windows should also have some added details around them. Staff suggests trim work or a pop-out.
- No details have been provided on the lighting locations on the elevations. All exterior lighting should conform to Section 408 of the Zoning Ordinance with regard to shielding, lumen count, and fixture type. Mercury vapor fixtures are not permitted.
- The banding on the bottom of the building should be river rock or some kind of stone on the portion that is not blocked by the headlight wall.
- Introduction of another color would add a great deal of visual interest and highlight the architectural features of the building.
- The eastern elevation along Highway 260 is rather plain. More details could be added to this portion of the building.
- There are no details on the outdoor courtyard. The board may want to review a plan and a detailed elevation for final approval.
- The southern sections of both buildings have windows for the shops and offices inside. The windows are desirable; however, awnings or another type of window shade would add visual interest and would help shade the windows in the summer.

- The blue banding around the building is not in scale with the rest of the building. A wider banding might be desirable.
- A comprehensive sign plan for the office/retail building is needed. A uniform size for the sign cans is preferred.
- There are no details on any freestanding or shopping center signs.
- There are no details on where trash dumpsters or mechanical units will be placed.
- There are no details on where the backflow device will be.
- The back out parking in the parking area adjacent to the Starbucks building is dangerous and not preferred.
- There is a need for an additional headlight wall to block headlight glare from the parking area on the western side of the site. This wall should match the other wall along the Starbucks portion of the property.
- A detailed and highly developed pedestrian crossing should be created on the access driveway to the Home Depot parking lot. There are significant grades at this location that should be taken into consideration.

Staff believes that the project submittal may require further details. We recommend that the board request the applicant to resubmit for Design Review and address the above list of items.

Items discussed were as follows.

- Pete Schultz - The lot would be split into three parcels (not four).
- Schultz - There would not be attached parking to the Chamber of Commerce piece. However, five spaces of "cross parking" would be dedicated to the Chamber.
- Schultz – consider a solid hedge instead of the headlight wall.
- Schultz – Chamber floor is above the highway.
- Backus – five-foot wall would hide river rock banding at the bottom of the building. A hedge of photinia here and on the other side might be better.
- Schultz – we could plant them closer together to start with and "weed" some out later if needed. The wall would have to be right on the property line. Starbuck's has set standards so you have no freedom. A wall could not vary three inches one way or the other. Starbuck's would not want to enable people to hide behind a wall.
- Member Lovett – it is a beautiful building but the building should reflect Cottonwood and the Verde Valley. She would prefer a southwestern look.
- Phil Terbell – would try to incorporate items from Jerome, Clarkdale, and Cottonwood into the landscaping.
- Director Gehlert – shared parking agreements will become more common in developments that are not part of subdivisions. The agreements should be recorded in perpetuity.
- Schultz – we have a signed and notarized agreement with Home Depot that they will give this project thirty-six spaces.
- Gehlert – Home Depot has excessive parking. Planning and Zoning is looking at possible amendments to the zoning ordinance to redefine the parking ratio for big-box stores and set ground rules for shared parking agreements. He cited other areas with ratios of one space per 250 square feet of floor area and ours is one per 200.
- Gehlert – staff is concerned that future development of the site could mean that all Chamber parking would be off-site and development of a tangible pedestrian crossing zone is important. In addition, CAT wants to develop a bus stop and that should be considered in the pedestrian crossing plan.

- Gehlert – emphasized the visibility of the property and said staff wants attention given to the elevations (design). He encouraged the Board to be comfortable with the elevations before acting on the proposal.
- Gehlert – emphasized concern about headlight trespass into the highway system. He said that if we end up with numerous walls we should look at serious design standards. He cited the wall at Walgreen's as an example. Gehlert and Backus discussed whether landscaping would sufficiently obscure headlights.
- Gehlert – suggested an LED sign instead of using banners as in the past.
- Member Bartmus - asked if the outside seating would be a distraction. Mr. Schultz said they talked about placing a lower wall and landscaping there to define the patio. There was miscellaneous discussion about the patio being close to the highway, noise, etc.
- Schultz – considers the hard corner as shared between the Chamber and Starbucks.
- Terbell – talked about signage such as “Visitor Center.” “One Mile Ahead” and “Left Lane Ahead” information could be added to that signage.
- Terbell – wants a joint-use agreement for the parking lot that flows with the land no matter what the ownership is to prevent future issues.
- Member Cox – suggested a 4-5 foot wide speed hump (speed table), paved in a distinctive way that would double as a pedestrian crossing.
- Member Cox – suggested installing scattered glass blocks in the block wall and illuminating them at night to add glister or distinction to the wall. Mr. Schultz described another method of adding interest to a block wall and the Board discussed other possible architectural details. Director Gehlert suggested berms and mounding instead of so much block wall.

Director Gehlert asked Mr. Terbell if the Chamber is talking about what the building should look like. Mr. Terbell said the Chamber felt it should be a modern looking building but they did not come to consensus on specifics. The Board discussed the difficulty in determining what “look” is desirable for Cottonwood and that variety is important. Mr. Rooney felt a “western theme” was missing and suggested a western mural. There was a general response that we do not want murals followed by explanations of why. Mr. Rooney commented that the renderings do not show any character to the building.

Mr. Schultz said a detail cornice around the tile roof would look good. He reviewed suggestions Mr. Ballew made, such as roof detail and stone veneer, and said they could do some of those. He said he was not a fan of river rock but would consider some rock veneer accents. He and the Board discussed several possible ways to add detail.

Mr. Schultz talked about the following issues.

- Signage - three monument signs and one sign on the building. They would submit a comprehensive sign package to cover all of it.
- Backflow prevention devices - Mr. Schultz would prefer to have them in the building but if he had to put them outside, he would build a little wall around them.
- Dumpsters – Mr. Schultz showed the locations and explained that they would have to roll them out.

Director Gehlert said staff asked for additional architectural detail; was concerned about the character of the headlight wall; and wanted additional detail on the pedestrian crossing near the bus stop. He asked the Board for their opinion.

Chairperson Backus expressed a preference for bushes instead of a headlight wall. Director Gehlert and Mr. Schultz discussed how bushes would screen headlights from the drive-thru initially. Mr. Schultz believed that 15-gallon photinias planted three feet apart would provide adequate screening within one season. Chairperson Backus questioned what would happen if the photinias were not adequate. Director Gehlert and Chairperson Backus discussed using berms in combination with plants. Director Gehlert recommended that Mr. Schultz do a footprint of the wall and a combination of pushing dirt against it and placing bushes in front of it. Then, if the bushes are not adequate, they could make the wall taller.

A discussion about the use of rock veneer or river rock ensued. Chairperson Backus recommended Michigan river rock, which is multicolored.

Director Gehlert asked the Board if they wanted to see an amended elevation. Chairperson Backus said he trusted Mr. Schultz to make it look nice. Mr. Schultz asked the Board to stipulate what they want so he can proceed with construction permits. Chairperson Backus said they do not need to come back to the Board with an amended elevation.

Member Lovett suggested big trees and awnings to pick up some color.

**Member Backus motioned to approve DRB 08-017 with five stipulations, as follows:**

- 1. Incorporate multi-colored river rock veneer (such as Michigan River Stone) in the design theme.**
- 2. That cornices are placed on the fascia at the top of the structure.**
- 3. That the headlight barrier wall is a combination of a two-foot high (above driveway grade) masonry wall and 15-gallon photinias planted on 3-foot centers with mounding between sidewalks and the headlight barrier wall (subject to ADOT approval).**
- 4. That design of the crosswalk on the access road to Home Depot is submitted. The Board specified that the crosswalk should be on top of a speed table.**
- 5. That the applicant submits a comprehensive sign plan for staff approval.**

**Member Bartmus seconded and the Board voted unanimously for approval.**

Additionally, staff highlighted the following for consideration in the lot-split process.

- On-site handicap parking might be required by code.
- Off-premise permanent signs are not allowed by code.

## **Board Discussion**

### **▪ General**

No discussion.

### **▪ Reports and Updates**

Director Gehlert reported that the next month's agenda would include the Recreation Center and Fry's fueling station.

**Adjournment**

***Chairperson Backus adjourned the meeting 5:45 p.m.***

*Minutes prepared by* \_\_\_\_\_  
*Carol Hulse, Planning Technician*  
*(From a recording and Ms. Foxton's notes)*

*Date Approved* \_\_\_\_\_